



**United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

Paper No. 10

**DR. ROBERT C. CHIN  
12909 STANZEL DRIVE  
AUSTIN, TX 78729**

**COPY MAILED**

**MAR 20 2003**

In re Application of	:	OFFICE OF PETITIONS
Shahzi Iqbal et al	:	
Application No. 09/961,089	:	DECISION ON PETITION
Filed: September 24, 2001	:	UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6)
Attorney Docket No. GX1-10	:	

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6), filed March 4, 2003, to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) for the benefit of a prior-filed provisional application.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

Any request for reconsideration of this decision must be filed within two months of the mail date of this decision. Note 37 CFR 1.181(f).

A petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000. Further, the petition is appropriate only after expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR 1.78(a)(5)(ii) and must be filed during the pendency of the nonprovisional application. In addition, the petition must be accompanied by:

- (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(5)(i) to the prior-filed application, unless previously submitted;<sup>1</sup>
- (2) the surcharge set forth in § 1.17(t); and

---

<sup>1</sup> Any nonprovisional application claiming the benefit of one or more prior-filed provisional applications must contain or be amended to contain a reference (i.e., in an amendment to the first line of the specification following the title or in an application data sheet (ADS)) to each such prior-filed provisional application, identifying it as a provisional application, and including the application number (consisting of the series code and serial number).

(8) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(5)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.

The instant pending nonprovisional application was filed on September 24, 2001, within twelve months of the filing date of the prior provisional application, Application No. 60/234,751, which was filed on September 25, 2000, and for which priority is claimed. A reference to the prior-filed provisional application has been included in an amendment to the first sentence of the specification following the title.

However, the amendment is not acceptable as drafted since it improperly incorporates by reference the prior-filed application. Petitioner's attention is directed to Dart Industries v. Banner, 636 F.2d 684, 207 USPQ 273 (C.A.D.C. 1980), where the court drew a distinction between a permissible 35 U.S.C. § 120 statement and the impermissible introduction of new matter by way of incorporation by reference in a 35 U.S.C. § 120 statement. The court specifically stated:

Section 120 merely provides a mechanism whereby an application becomes entitled to benefit of the filing date of an earlier application disclosing the same subject matter. Common subject matter must be disclosed, in both applications, either specifically or by an express incorporation-by-reference of prior disclosed subject matter. Nothing in section 120 itself operates to carry forward any disclosure from an earlier application. In re deSeversky, supra at 674, 177 USPQ at 146-147. Section 120 contains no magical disclosure-augmenting powers able to pierce new matter barriers. It cannot, therefore, "limit" the absolute and express prohibition against new matter contained in section 251.

In order for the incorporation by reference statement to be effective as a proper safeguard against the omission of a portion of a prior application, the incorporation by reference statement must be included in the specification-as-filed, or in an amendment specifically referred to in an oath or declaration executing the application. See In re de Seversky, supra. Note also MPEP 201.06(c).

Additionally, the petition does not comply with item (3) above in that the required statement of unintentional delay has not been submitted.

Accordingly, before the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6) can be granted, a substitute amendment<sup>2</sup> deleting the incorporation by reference statement, a proper statement of unintentional delay, and a renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6) are required.

**In order to expedite consideration, petitioner may wish to submit the substitute amendment and renewed petition by facsimile transmission to the number indicated below and to the attention of the undersigned..**

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail:            U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
                          P.O. Box 2327  
                          Mail Stop DAC  
                          Arlington, VA 22202

OR

Commissioner for Patents  
Box DAC  
Washington, D.C. 20231

By FAX:            (703) 308-6916  
                         Attn: Office of Petitions

By hand:            Crystal Plaza Four, Suite 3C23  
                         2201 South Clark Place  
                         Arlington, VA 22202

Any questions concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (703) 305-8680.

*Frances Hicks*  
Frances Hicks  
Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions  
Office of the Deputy Commissioner  
for Patent Examination Policy

---

<sup>2</sup> Note 37 CFR 1.121